

Victoria Symptom Validity Test

by Daniel Slick, PhD, Grace Hopp, MA
& Esther Strauss, PhD, and PAR Staff

Score Report/Interpretive Guide

—Client Information—

Client Name: Robert Brockman
ID Number: 05182021
Date of Testing: 05/19/2021
Date of Birth: [REDACTED]
Age: 79
Gender: Male
Education: 17
Reported Ethnicity:
Marital Status: m

Complaints of Memory Dysfunction:
Possible Litigation:
Date of Injury: / /
Loss of Consciousness (LOC):
Duration of LOC:
Length of Post Traumatic Amnesia:
Results of Neuroimaging:
Setting:
Previous Head Injury:
Previous Testing:
Sensory/Motor Impairments:
Other Neurological/Medical Disorders:

This report is designed to assist in the interpretation of performance on the Victoria Symptom Validity Test (VSVT). The VSVT provides one measure of the level of effort expended on test-taking by clients referred for psychological or neuropsychological evaluations.

The VSVT and other forced-choice tests are often referred to as “symptom validity tests,” rather than “malingering tests,” because unusually poor performance may reflect poor effort, deliberate feigning, exaggeration of real cognitive deficits, factors independent of conscious dissimulation and external rewards, or any combination of the above. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to recognize that VSVT scores are, at best, capable of indicating that factors other than cognitive impairment may be influencing a client’s performance. Even in cases where financial or other incentives exist and where performance on the VSVT is in the questionable range, the client may be legitimately impaired, acting without conscious intent, or a combination of both.

The clinician using the VSVT should be knowledgeable about the research and ethical issues related to assessing symptom validity. Considerable caution and good judgment should be exercised when interpreting the results of symptom validity tests such as VSVT due to the potentially serious implications of results suggesting less than optimal effort. The clinician is strongly encouraged to employ additional measures to assess effort and motivation whenever the client’s VSVT performance raises concerns about the level of effort expended during an evaluation. More reliable and accurate conclusions about a client’s motivation and effort can best be made through the use of multiple assessment instruments and additional sources of information.

Copyright © 1997 by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
All rights reserved

US v. Brockman

DX-65

Case No: 4:21-cr-0009

DBD-0000110

VSVT Summary Scores

Items Correct score	Raw score	Binomial <i>p</i> value	Suggested interpretation
Easy Items Correct	15/24	0.9242	Questionable
Difficult Items Correct	8/24	0.0758	Questionable
Total Items Correct	23/48	0.4427	Questionable

Note. Raw scores indicate the number of items correct/maximum number of items in the category.

Between-Group Comparisons: Items Correct Scores

Items Correct score	Client (<i>n</i> = 1)	Comparison Groups				
			Control (<i>n</i> = 95)	Feigning (<i>n</i> = 43)	Comp (<i>n</i> = 205)	Non-comp (<i>n</i> = 32)
Easy Items Correct	15	<i>M</i>	23.97	20.30	23.33	23.53
		<i>SD</i>	0.18	4.35	1.97	1.19
Difficult Items Correct	8	<i>M</i>	23.44	10.95	20.17	22.63
		<i>SD</i>	0.92	6.06	4.80	1.79
Total Items Correct	23	<i>M</i>	47.41	31.26	43.50	46.16
		<i>SD</i>	0.92	9.05	6.08	2.59

Note. Comp = Compensation-seeking; Non-comp = Non-compensation seeking.

Descriptive Statistics for Response Latency Variables

Response Latency scores (seconds)	Classification		
	Valid (above chance)	Questionable (at chance)	Invalid (below chance)
Easy Items			
<i>M</i>	1.67	2.84	3.40
<i>SD</i>	0.73	1.45	1.02
95% Confidence Interval	1.58 - 1.77	2.26 - 3.42	2.81 - 3.99
Difficult Items			
<i>M</i>	2.68	5.50	4.70
<i>SD</i>	1.28	3.44	1.67
95% Confidence Interval	2.52 - 2.85	4.11 - 6.89	3.73 - 5.67

Note. Number of respondents within the three classification groups are as follows: Valid ($n = 135$); Questionable ($n = 20$); and Invalid ($n = 15$).

Between-Group Comparisons: Response Latency

Response Latency scores (seconds)	Client ($n = 1$)	Comparison Groups			
		Control ($n = 95$)	Feigning ($n = 43$)	Comp ($n = 205$)	Non-comp ($n = 32$)
Easy Items					
<i>M</i>	6.50	1.29	2.48	2.06	1.61
<i>SD</i>	3.85	0.37	1.05	1.04	0.53
Difficult Items					
<i>M</i>	8.91	1.93	4.08	3.45	2.61
<i>SD</i>	11.74	0.51	2.12	2.02	1.11
Total Items					
<i>M</i>	7.71	1.61	3.28	2.76	2.11
<i>SD</i>	8.73	0.41	1.43	1.45	0.80

Note. Comp = Compensation-seeking; Non-comp = Non-compensation seeking.

Item Scores for Block 1

	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	Incorrect		
Item 1	X		Easy	10.16
Item 2	X		Easy	10.12
Item 3		X	Difficult	7.09
Item 4	X		Easy	4.01
Item 5	X		Easy	0.94
Item 6		X	Difficult	16.58
Item 7		X	Difficult	2.88
Item 8	X		Easy	12.13
Item 9	X		Difficult	7.11
Item 10		X	Easy	11.33
Item 11		X	Difficult	59.72
Item 12		X	Difficult	8.29
Item 13		X	Easy	7.37
Item 14		X	Easy	12.62
Item 15		X	Difficult	7.99
Item 16		X	Difficult	6.08

Score Totals for Block 1 (16 items)

Easy Items Correct = 5	Easy Items Response Latency = 8.59
Difficult Items Correct = 1	Difficult Items Response Latency = 14.47
Total Items Correct = 6	Total Items Response Latency = 11.53

Note. Retention interval for Block 1 was 5 seconds.

Item Scores for Block 2

	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	Incorrect		
Item 1		X	Easy	12.10
Item 2		X	Difficult	5.55
Item 3	X		Easy	9.58
Item 4	X		Difficult	8.98
Item 5	X		Easy	3.56
Item 6	X		Difficult	6.43
Item 7		X	Easy	9.13
Item 8		X	Difficult	6.56
Item 9	X		Easy	8.91
Item 10	X		Easy	9.00
Item 11		X	Difficult	2.68
Item 12	X		Difficult	3.99
Item 13	X		Easy	2.99
Item 14	X		Easy	4.51
Item 15	X		Difficult	19.45
Item 16		X	Difficult	3.21

Score Totals for Block 2 (16 items)

Easy Items Correct = 6	Easy Items Response Latency = 7.47
Difficult Items Correct = 4	Difficult Items Response Latency = 7.11
Total Items Correct = 10	Total Items Response Latency = 7.29

Note. Retention interval for Block 2 was 10 seconds.

Item Scores for Block 3

	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	Incorrect		
Item 1	X		Difficult	4.73
Item 2		X	Difficult	7.43
Item 3	X		Easy	3.33
Item 4		X	Easy	1.74
Item 5	X		Difficult	1.45
Item 6		X	Difficult	1.96
Item 7		X	Easy	3.12
Item 8		X	Difficult	3.25
Item 9		X	Difficult	4.87
Item 10	X		Easy	3.19
Item 11	X		Easy	3.33
Item 12		X	Difficult	14.90
Item 13		X	Easy	0.84
Item 14	X		Difficult	2.76
Item 15	X		Easy	6.75
Item 16		X	Easy	5.20

Score Totals for Block 3 (16 items)

Easy Items Correct = 4	Easy Items Response Latency = 3.44
Difficult Items Correct = 3	Difficult Items Response Latency = 5.17
Total Items Correct = 7	Total Items Response Latency = 4.30

Note. Retention interval for Block 3 was 15 seconds.

Score Totals for Blocks 1-3 (48 items)

Easy Items Correct = 15	Easy Items Response Latency = 6.50
Difficult Items Correct = 8	Difficult Items Response Latency = 8.91
Total Items Correct = 23	Total Items Response Latency = 7.71

Right-Left Preference score: 0.29

(Scores < -0.6 indicate an extreme left-side preference; scores > 0.6 indicate an extreme right-side preference)